DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 233 SO 013 459

AUTHOR Petersen, Keith S.
TITLE Anglophone African, Asian and U.S. Black Newspaper Coverage of the United Nations, 1949-1977: A Comparative "Third World" Analysis.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 28p.: Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association (22nd, Philadelphia, PA, March 18-21, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks: Comparative Analysis: Developing Nations: Evaluation Criteria: Foreign Countries: Newspapers: *News Writing: Political Issues: *Press Opinion: Social Science Research: Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

This paper compares newspaper coverage of United Nations (UN) events in the United States and Great Britain, African and Asian nations, and in the black press in the United States. The method involved sampling UN-related coverage in 13 newspapers at four year intervals from 1949 to 1961 and for every second year from 1961 to 1977. Newspapers sampled were the "New York Times," the "Chicago Tribune," the "Times of London," "Dawn" (Karachi, Pakistan), the "Singapore Straits Times," the "Times of India," the "Pittsburgh Courier," the "Baltimore Afro-American," the Lagos "Daily Times," the "West African Pilot," the Tanzania "Daily News," the "Ethiopian Herald," and the "Voice of Uganda." Findings indicated that 1961 was the year which received the most UN-coverage, that the decrease in UN coverage has been greater in the Asian and Western press than in the African press, that the African press has concerned itself mostly with stories about UN-sponsored aid and/or colonialism, and that coverage in the American black press manifested considerable interest in the racial composition of delegations to UN agencies and meetings. Conclusions based on the survey include that the coverage in the press of African nations that were formerly British colonies has been more or less constant when compared with decreasing Asian UN-coverage, the black press in the United States has followed a pattern of coverage quite similar to the coverage in African newspapers, very little seems to have been covered in the Afro-Asian part of what is now called the Third World except economics, and all presses seem to cover mainly that UN-news which is more closely related to their own special ethnic, racial, regional, and continental interests than to any general world interest. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED204233

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

KEITH S. PETERSEN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ANGLOPHONE AFRICAN, ASIAN AND U. S. BLACK NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF THE UNITED NATIONS, 1949-1977: A COMPARATIVE "THIRD WORLD" ANALYSIS

A Paper Prepared for Presentation at the 22nd Annual Convention
of the International Studies Association
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 18-21 March, 1981

KEITH S. PETERSEN

Department of Political Science and Public Administration
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27650

SO 013 459

Anglophone African, Asian and U. S. Black Newspaper Coverage of the United Nations, 1949-1977: A Comparative "Third World" Analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper has three major purposes: (1) to pursue and expand a general comparative study of the extent, trends and focuses of newspaper coverage, worldwide, of United Nations events over time by adding a substantial sample of the anglophone African press to representatives of First and other "Third World" newspapers already surveyed; (2) to explore the similarities and/or differences of that coverage in a variety of Third World presses with a view to identifying and measuring different dimensions of possible agreement or disagreement in Third World perceptions of the UN and perhaps thereby even of itself; and (3) to appraise the nature and viability, if any, of the UN's "image" in the world, in the Third World especially and in anglophone Africa in particular that such a survey and comparison might reveal.

A word about where we are now in respect to some aspects at least of these pursuits may be in order at the outset. A comprehensive UNITAR study published in 1972 found first to its own displeasure that news coverage of the UN seemed to be declining rather sharply in the press of "advanced countries" (based on a very limited "spot check" in 1972 as against much more extensive 1968 data) but implied at least that this unwelcome trend would be, or perhaps had been, favorably balanced by "a comparatively heightened interest in information on the United Nations in the developing world."[1] Studies since then using extensively longitudinal data, have shown that the trend of UN coverage in the "elite" press in "advanced countries" is indeed down, fully confirming UNITAR'S suspicions, but that in a comparable sample of Asian papers, there has been an almost identically sharp decline, while a mix of the American black press, also reporting less than it once did about UN developments, has nevertheless declined less in its degree of UN interest over the years and is even more or less "holding its own."[2] I am reluctant to generalize from these findings about the trends of UN coverage in the "Third World" press except to say that Asian results by themselves certainly do not confirm UNITAR'S suggestion of a "heightened interest" in the UN in the "developing world" and to note that the evidence from American black newspapers, which may or may not be relevant at all, is at best ambiguous. An addition of comparable African data, which this paper undertakes, may help to resolve, or at least to clarify, some of the issues that are being raised here.

One such issue, manifestly -- the one to which the evidence of American black perceptions may or may not relate -- has to do with the characteristics and composition of the Third World itself. Arguments about the substance of this concept have certainly been spirited and may be unending.[3] I have been content for the most part to let that bloc or grouping in world affairs pretty much define itself: If a given unit (which may or may not be a "country" or a "state" in the formal sense) has been a member of either the (political) "non-aligned movement" or the (economic) "group of 77," I am willing to accept it as a component of the "Third World."[4] All of the "South" countries whose media I have in any part surveyed for use in this analysis are, by that easy standard, Third World countries. What most commentators furthermore agree that they usually have, at minimum, in common is a "colonial" experience from the "trauma"[5] of which they have emerged early or late, or from which they are still emerging, and a condition of economic or more generally sociological underdevelopment, now styled "developing," which may be most conveniently measured by low per capita gross national product or degree of industrialization figures, or both.[6]

In addition to the relatively unexceptionable list of entities that an application of one or more of these criteria might yield, I have chosen also to include in this analysis a consideration of the comparable perceptions of American blacks, at least insofar as a sampling of the Afro-American press may reveal them. I have done this on the grounds that blacks are a distinctive "minority" if not necessarily an actual or potential "nation" within the United States;[7] that they hold views, particularly on foreign affairs, that have been consistently and are sometimes quite dramatically different from those of American whites;[8] and that some, at least, of their own political and intellectual leaders have insisted on identifying them with other more commonly accepted denizens of the Third World in the very terms of economic and colonial experience that have been invoked here.[9]

These, in any event, are the purposes that I am pursuing and the range of comparisons within which I intend to pursue them. The following are in turn the most important conclusions in these regards that the attendant investigation now tentatively offers: (1) that coverage of the UN in the anglophone African press has not declined in either the same way or to the same extent as coverage in my sample of Asian newspapers but has ended up much more strikingly like U. S. black coverage, that is, more or less "holding its own;" (2) that the general kinds of UN stories, within these quantities, that the African national presses interest themselves in are likewise substantially more similar to the interests of the American black "minority" press than they are to those of their Asian national counterparts, although with interesting exceptions in both directions; (3) that very little seems <u>ever</u> to have

very much distinctively united the "Afro-Asian" part of what we are now calling the Third World except economics; and (4), and unsurprisingly, but perhaps most depressingly for visionaries of "one world" in general and UN supporters in particular, that all presses seem to cover about the UN the news of developments that are more closely related to their own special (ethnic, racial, regional, continental) interests than they are to any general "world interest" that might be ideally imagined.[10] The analysis from which these conclusions derive now needs to be turned to.

II. DATA AND METHOD

The Newspapers. For the purposes of this study, I have assembled generally comparable UN coverage information from the following newspapers in the following groups: three from the First World (the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and the Times of London), three from Asia (Dawn [Karachi], the Singapore Straits Times, the Times of India), two U. S. black papers (the "conservative" Pittsburgh Courier and the more "moderate" Baltimore Afro American)[11] and five from anglophone Africa: the Lagos Daily Times and the West African Pilot, both from Nigeria; the Tanzania Daily News, the Ethiopian Herald and the Voice of Uganda.

The selection of these last is dictated first by their durability (through ownership changes and/or displacements on more than one occasion) and continuous accessibility over relatively long periods of time and, secondly, by their relative importance (measured by comparatively high circulation figures at least on the average and despite sometimes rather radical variations) in their respective countries. Within these constraints they are also intended to offer something of a cross section of the English language press in Africa -- geographically, historically and, with some even extreme variations in their own respective settings or statuses from time to time, ideologically.

The two Nigerian papers are both private with the Times seeming to be the more "conservative" of the two (being said in one characterization using prominent British referrents to have been given "the improbable role of a Mirror in presentation and a Times in being a newspaper of record") while the West African Pilot, according to the same account, "still represents radicalism from an Ibo point of view;"[12] certainly, whatever "Ibo radicalism" may imply, the Pilot is consciously and explicitly "worker" - oriented and its UN coverage has consistently manifested that perspective. The Tanzania Daily News (once the privately owned Standard until nationalized in 1970) has been located on a comparative African scale as being "somewhere in between" a "moderate" and a "progressive' orientation, a characterization with which I would not disagree.[13] The Ethiopian Herald, always a government

paper, has done very much what its quite dramatically changing public authorities have wanted it to, offering little local news but "the best balance" (and a relatively large quantity) of "world news" under Haile Selassie[14] and turning to both a more strident and a more parochial propagation of the gospel of the "revolution" under the far more radical military leadership since 1974. The Voice of Uganda, finally, also once private (as the Uganda Argus), was "taken over by Amin's government in 1972" and is said since then, with the rest of the Uganda press altogether, to have fallen "back to where it had been some 30 years before" -- that is, not prospering any more, as it had once in the '50's and '60's.[15] It is not substantially different in either format or outlook from the neighboring Tanzania Daily News except, of course, where the views of Idi Amin and Julius Nyrere were in sharp conflict, as they obviously have been, although quite negligibly so in the general framework and focus of United Nations activities.

Process and Analysis. Samples of all of these papers were viewed, with minor exception, at regular four-year intervals, 1949-1961, and then for every other year, 1961-1977.[16] For the U. S. black papers, which are weeklies, those "samples" included every issue in each of those years, 52 issues per year; for all others, which either are or became dailies, they included as much as possible the issues of the full week, Sunday to Saturday, that the regular UN General Assembly opened in September and the Tuesday and Wednesday of the comparable week in every other month of the year, always totalling 29 issues.[17] All news stories about the United Nations, regardless of length, in all indicated issues of all papers consulted were identified and recorded. A UN story was taken to be an account of any activity by, or event taking place within or directly relating to, any United Nations office, organization or agency, permanent or ad hoc, including the whole family of "specialized" or otherwise special agencies which operate mostly in social and economic policy areas. The resulting annual totals of such stories became the gross indicators of comparative amounts of attention to, or interest in, the UN for each paper or group of papers in any given year or combination of years.

These stories were in turn classified and grouped under one or another of 20 main headings, with or without subheadings, that were designed to yield large enough quantities of stories to permit meaningful comparisons of subject matter emphasis of interest in the UN in a variety of newspapers, across continents and cultures and, wherever appropriate, over considerable periods of time. A complete listing of these headings and subheadings, with illustrative examples and/or indication of tabular abbreviations that will be used subsequently, are displayed in Table 1. The degrees of story emphasis derived from these classifications were used to discover the developing focuses of attention in each paper or group of papers

over the years and to compare such focuses with those of other papers or groups of papers both within and between political "worlds." Thus the questions of how much attention to what kind(s) of "UN stories" has been manifested by particular newspapers or groups of papers over the years are now ready to be addressed.

III. FINDINGS

Gross Quantity Comparisons. The UN story totals in each newspaper, or group of newspapers, surveyed for all sample years in which data were gathered are shown in Table 2. Three overall conclusions are immediately apparent. (1) Whereas both the First World and the Asian press gave similarly and relatively great amounts of attention to UN activities in the early years of these surveyed here, their interest in such matters has consistently, drastically and, again, quite similarly declined since 1961 to a figure that is very close in the last year and in both cases to only one third of their respective average numbers of UN stories per sample year.[18] (2) For reasons that may be obvious, the "most attentive" year for all papers or groups of papers surveyed is, without exception, 1961: The Congo imbroglio and the death of Hammarskjold, for whatever possibly conflicting motives, transfixed them all.[19] (3) Overall quantity patterns of anglophone African and U. S. black press coverage of the UN are otherwise distinctively different from those of both Asia and the West and very closely resemble each other, at least collectively if not always individually.

Coverage by my two U. S. black papers, anyway, while down from its 1961 high as all papers are, has nevertheless at least "held its own" in recent years, even to the extent of exceeding their composite annual average of UN stories in 1977. The combined results for all three African newspapers for which I have data for all 12 survey sample years are substantially the same: down from 1961, but even a little better than holding their own in recent years, including 1977. Not even African, or black American, figures will thus give much comfort to UNITAR's expectations of "heightened interest" in the UN in the Third World, but at least they have not declined as they have in Asia -- composite African results, unlike black American, have even been quite stable for the past 14 years -- and may suggest some hope for the maintenance of a rather minimum support for the UN in the Third World if not for its burgeoning and counterbalancing increase against the decreased attractiveness and even apparently active down-grading of the UN not only in the West but also in Asia.

The implications of the African record may even be a bit more hopeful than that in general. In only two of the five African papers consulted has there been

a very marked decrease of interest in UN activities -- a decrease which is still substantially less than that in any of their Western or Asian counterparts -- and both have rather special and obvious reasons for that decline. As already noted first in respect to the Ethiopian Herald, it has taken a quite different, and much more "parochial," tack since the overthrow of Haile Selassi in 1974 by the military socialists who run Ethiopia now. This overthrow was surely an example of the only kind and degree of change, as Russett has argued, that debilitates "the power of macroscopic prediction."[20] Ethiopia is still African, of course, and still located in the Third World. But the Dergue has actively and purposely destroyed many continuities. The "balanced view" which a small national elite used to be given of the outside world in general and the UN in particular is manifestly one of them.

In Nigeria, secondly, the West African Pilot has not yet recovered, if it ever will, from the vagaries and even disasters of partisan and national politics, including the Biafran civil war itself, that have reduced it from the bustling, attractive newspaper that it once was to the obviously ill-financed and apparently almost fugitive sheet that it has since become. It seems still to retain its "radical" or worker-oriented interest. But its resources are clearly limited and quite probably it reports the UN--and its favorite UN agency, the I.L.O. -- substantially less than it would if it could. Both of these African papers have thus been profoundly affected by other variables than being African. So, of course, have the other three. These last, however, being more stable, may be somewhat more representative of whatever general "African," or anglophone African, interest in the UN may be presumed to exist. Representative or not, their variously respective levels of interest have been quite stoutly maintained. The tentative general theme may therefore be perhaps more confidently returned to: Anglophone Africa's ardor for the UN does not much increase, but it holds; so does black America's. Asia's does not.

Anglophone African Focuses of UN Interest. In what particular aspects of UN activity have anglophone African newspapers manifested any special degree of interest? Have these focuses of attention been fairly consistent or have they varied markedly from one newspaper, or country, to another? To address these questions we must look beneath or beyond the mere overall quantities of UN stories in one (kind of) newspaper or another to what those stories, and particularly the most frequent or important ones among them, have been about. For this purpose, as indicated earlier, I have classified and grouped all UN stories into one or another of the categories (and, where appropriate, sub-categories) set forth in Table 1. Where the numbers of stories in such categories are large enough to exploit without undue distortion I have identified and ranked the top three stories in order of priority for each

anglophone African newspaper for each year and then summarized these rankings across all newspapers for which I have data in any given year. The results are displayed in Table 3. What does this table tell us about the particular subjects of anglophone African interest in the UN?

A perusal of its last column, where the results are summarized for "all papers combined," will yield the most important conclusions most quickly. The first is that these papers have overwhelmingly most concerned themselves altogether with aspects of "specialized and special agencies and aid" (abbreviated here: Spec Ags): one of the top three stories in nine of the twelve years here surveyed, from as early as 1957, when it was #1, to 1977, when it was #1 again.[21] Their overall second-ranking story, five times in twelve years, was "Africa vs. West" and the third, three times, "economic, social and humanitarian" concerns in general. Of these three the last one has faded, not having appeared in any year's "top three" since it was #3 in 1963, while the other two have vigorously maintained themselves, being respectively #1 and #2 in the most recent year surveyed, 1977. Anglophone Africa's UN heart thus clearly lies first in its pocketbook and secondly in what for the moment we will call its neighborhood.

Are these UN interests consistent across newspapers and countries? Pretty much so. First of all, "agencies and aid" is the first ranking story over all years surveyed in all five newspapers -- and usually by a substantial margin -- except the Tanzania Daily News, where it is narrowly #2 (five times in its top three stories in eleven measurable years versus six for "Africa v. West"). "Africa v. West" is, conversely, the overall second ranking story in all five except in the Daily News where it is, again, #1. "Economic, social and humanitarian" concerns, slightly less impressively, are third or tied for third in three of the five papers, tied for fourth in another (the Ethiopian Herald: only one listing in ten years) and missing altogether from its overall "top three" in the Voice of Uganda. But these two exceptions are the two for which data from the two to four earliest survey years are missing, precisely those years when that topic was of greatest interest in the anglophone African press in general. The Herald and the Voice (or Argus) are thus not so much "inconsistent" as they are late. Overall consistency among all five is almost absolute after 1961.

There is one other aspect of anglophone Africa's concern -- no matter how inconsistent, no matter how faded -- with economic, social and humanitarian interests to which attention should be called. That heading shows up for a total of ten times, counting individual paper and "combined" columns separately (in 55 "measurable" years) in Table 3. Five of those times (twice in the three listings in the "combined" column) it has the same measurable subheading, the only measurable subheading

that it ever has: "colonial." Recall two details now from Table 1: that "colonial" (or "colonialism") is one of five subheadings into which this classification was divided (race, rights, refugees and "miscellaneous" being the others) and that it was used to subsume materials about colonialism in general especially including the work, pretty much in chronological sequence, of the Trusteeship Council, the Committee on Information from Nonselfgoverning Territories and the Committee of 24.

What has that work been about? Let us look at a few samples from different newspapers in different years. The (then) Tanganyika Standard, April 26, 1949: "Britain Criticised by U. N. O. [Trust Council] Over West African Trusteeship [in the Cameroons]." Lagos Daily Times, September 20, 1957: "U.N. [Trust Council] Debates French Togoland." West African Pilot, January 17, 1961: "UN [Security Council] Rejects Afro-Asian charges [re Rwanda-Urundi trust]." Ethiopian Herald, March 19, 1969: "Anguilla Envoy Asks UN [Colonialism Committee] to Stop [British] Invasion." Voice of Uganda, December 19, 1973: "Assembly Rules on Portugal's Delegates' " -- deciding, that is, that they could not represent their then still nonselfgoverning territories in Africa.

This is not an unbiased sample, but it is not an unfair one. With the exception of the Caribbean island of Anguilla in 1969 -- and there are other similar "exceptions:" Aden in 1967, the Seychelles Islands in 1973 -- these concerns are largely, and often exclusively, about Africa. Furthermore, they seem for the most part to be a merely earlier stage of the kinds of conflicts that I have ultimately grouped under the rubric of "Africa vs. West." There is, after all, little difference in substantive concern between a 1973 story about a Security Council draft resolution which "urges tougher action against Rhodesia" (Ethiopian Herald, 11-21-73) and a 1963 account of allegations before the UN Colonialism Committee of "'tyranny' in Southern Rhodesia" (Tanganyika Standard, 6-19-63) except the accidents of time, atmosphere, agency and presumption of independence to which my categorical applications have deferred. In any event, this "colonial" subheading is very close in African usage to the later -- the descendant, even -- classification of "Africa v. West." When African UN coverage is compared shortly with other "Third World" focuses of interest in the UN, that connection will be important.

Two final observations may be offered on the subject matter emphasis of anglophone African concerns with the UN by themselves. (1) Some classification headings cannot possibly place among any overall list of "top three" stories, African or other, over any extended period of time because they are tied specifically to historical controversies which, although very important in certain particular years that this analysis surveys, have subsequently been greatly reduced in intensity or have for all practical purposes disappeared: Korea (1953), the Congo (1961),

China seat (1971). Did the anglophone African press care about these when they occurred? The Congo, yes: It was the top story in all four African papers surveyed in 1961. The China seat slightly less so: somewhere in the top three in all four newspaper years that were measurable in 1971, but not quite a heavy enough emphasis to be listed as a "first" story in the "combined" totals for that year. Korea, yes too, but note that 1953 is relatively the lightest year of anglophone African interest in the UN at all; Korea is the first story in that year, to be sure, but it is not first among many. The Congo got 96 stories in four papers in 1961; China got 30½ in five in 1971; Korea got a total of only 15 in three papers in 1953. Despite its top ranking and high percentage in its own year, Korea may thus have been a somewhat weaker focus of African attention than it seems.

(2) Other UN stories may show up either routinely (general UN Organization of Process) or irregularly (Mideast), depending on the occurences of historical events. Of either of these kinds, the anglophone African press gives relatively most, but absolutely not much, attention to "general UN" developments (twice in 12 years the second-ranking story in the combined list, one of which subsumes the death of Hammarskjold in 1961). The Mideast, a perennial UN focus of attention, also shows up only twice (1949, 1967) and not higher than #3 on either occasion. One other fairly frequent but quite irregular UN concern, here labeled Asia v. Self, appears only once (#3 in 1965). "Unit organization and process" (tied for second, 1969) and "Members' policies and appraisals" (tied for third, 1949) also provide one entry apiece. There are no others among the total list of top three stories in these combined papers. The evidence of scarcity or absence may be almost as interesting as that of emphasis, as we shall see.

Comparative Third World Concerns with the UN. How have anglophone African press interests in the UN compared to those of other (possibly) Third World presses? Does there seem to be a generalizable Third World interest in the UN at all and, if there is, how closely does anglophone Africa represent it? To ponder these questions, as indicated earlier, I am weighing evidence from comparable samples of, besides anglo-African, both Asian and Afro-American presses.[22] The overall "gross quantity" comparisons we have already seen: in measurements of trends of total UN coverage over almost thirty years the Asian press is very much closer to its First World than it is to either its anglophone African and Afro-American counterparts, which last fairly closely resemble each other.

Do the same distinctions and comparisons hold up for emphasis of subject matter interest? By and large, yes, but as already noted, with interesting variations. How may these comparisons with the anglophone African press most conveniently be presented? In other studies cited earlier I have made the same

UN story emphasis and priority analyses as the one for anglophone Africa (Table 3) that we have just been considering. There is no need to redisplay these equally detailed tables here. But from any and all of them an overall priority list of "top three" UN stories can be fairly easily derived. Three such lists, for the three "Third World" presses to be compared here, have been developed.[23] The comparative results for those presses are displayed in Table 4 and may be inspected now. With what results?

Obviously there has been something less than complete Third World agreement on the focuses of its UN interests as there was earlier on their overall frequencies. Let us explore the disagreements, singly or in groups as appropriate, in the declining order of their differentials, that is, looking at priorities that most divide the Third World first and the ones on which it is most united last. The four on which it most disagrees (with a 6½ to 8½ "point spread" between the middle ranking one of the three priority listings for a given item and its more extreme variant, whichever one of the other two that may be) are, in order: Africa vs. the West; economic, social and humanitarian concerns; Asia vs. self; and Members' delegations.

Remember first in respect to the second-listed (and -ranking) one of these that "colonialism" was its most (indeed, its only) appearing sub-focus in the anglophone African press, a kind of "pre-Africa-vs.-West" concern, as we have seen. Then (1) the top three of these four most dissensual priorities have to do with events that have occurred and reoccurred over considerable periods of time and in particular locations and (2) Asia is the "odd man out" in respect to all three. Asians care more about what is happening in Asia, while Africans -- and other blacks -- care more about what is happening in Africa. An already stated "natural" conclusion is thus impressively documented: to each his own "neighborhood" troubles and struggles, first. An interesting corollary is likewise added: Race conquers space. Whatever formulas of general policy consensus the Third World may derive, it clearly exhibits sometimes radically different degrees of emotional commitment -- regional or, as the corollary shows, racial.

"Members' delegations" is a close fourth at the top of the disagreement list. The "odd man out" this time is not Asia, but American blacks, who manifest a relatively much greater interest in this kind of news than do other Africans or Asians or, indeed, anybody else in the world. Why? The delegation news that is offered to US blacks is primarily about the composition of U. S. delegations to one or another UN agency or meeting, which is hardly surprising; news about one's own delegation(s) is the usual fare around the world when "delegation" information appears at all. What is unique about this coverage to American blacks is that

they are concerned overwhelmingly with which blacks, if any -- or, sometimes, which hateful whites -- may or may not be on those delegations and hardly at all with their appointment, composition, authorization or dispatch otherwise.[24] These are clearly the special interests of ~~what~~ I have earlier called a "minority." The populations of independent countries, regardless of color, simply do not care much about such details. This exception from a Third World (or even a world-wide) consensus is thus a very special affliction. "National" independence -- or total integration -- would cure it. Nobody else (except, presumably, in other "minority" presses around the world) is likely to duplicate it.

The two (identically) next severest priority disagreements are on the Middle East and on specialized agencies and aid. Asia is the deviant on the first, black America on the second. Their respective explanations are already in hand. Asia covers the Middle East more than Africa or black America does because -- in part geographically and, perhaps more importantly, culturally -- that is where the Middle East is: "neighborhood" again. (Certainly it is not in black Africa: race again.) Black Americans care less than Africans and Asians do about UN "agencies and aid" because they do not receive any. Why not? Because, again, they are a "minority" in the United States. Agencies and aid are for American blacks the work of US (national or state) government and not of international organizations. They do not much report what they do not see. Independence again, or lack of it, is the key.

There is a further and a more important point. Except for U. S. blacks' understandable, and relatively severe, downgrading of the matter, the activities of UN agencies and aid are not only an agreed but also an extreme Third World emphasis. It is not simply that this item is #1 in both the anglophone African and Asian presses; it is overwhelmingly #1: nine times in the top three UN stories in twelve years in anglophone Africa, as we have seen; ten times in twelve years in the combination of my three Asian newspapers.[25] Economics thus clearly seems to define the internationally typical (i.e., independent country) Third World much more than anything else does. Newspaper coverage impressively reconfirms what everybody "knows" anyway: The Group of 77, no matter what its problems, has a great deal more to share and fight for than does the non-aligned movement -- whatever of the latter may be left after 1979 in Havana and February, 1981, in New Delhi.

Other disagreements are less (or agreements are greater) and may be disposed of more quickly. The next ranking one down, unit organization and process, is a scarcely significant dissensus since all three priority levels are low, while some are merely lower than others: Asian papers list it twice among their top three annual stories, anglophone African once and U. S. black papers no times. The same is true of "Members' policies" which only appears on the list at all because one

press (the U. S. black) lists it once and that once (1975) in third place; the others do not list it. Korea, listed anywhere in 1953 only, is more interesting in that both Asia and anglophone Africa give it first place in that year and the American black press, oddly enough, gives it no place at all. Afro-American newspapers in this regard stand apart not only from the Third World but apparently also from the whole world, for whatever reasons: Korea is 1953's first or second ranking UN story in all three First World papers that I consulted, too.[26]

"China seat" priority differentials, next, are somewhat more interesting between worlds than within them. It is, to be sure, the highest ranking story in anglophone Africa in 1971 but not quite heavily enough emphasized to rate a #1 placement, as we have seen; it is also #2, losing out to "agencies and aid," in 1971 in Asia and is not quite strong enough to "place" at all in the U.S. black "top three" (it is #4) in the same year. All three of my First World papers, on the other hand, give it solidly first ranking, also in 1971, the only year when it appears anywhere. Motives were no doubt mixed on all sides but from the pattern of these slight variations alone one might be tempted to offer one very tentative, serendipitous hypothesis: That which is feared and opposed is a better attention-getter than what is hoped or expected.

The last two, equally at the bottom of the list -- that is, on the priorities of which the Third World is most united -- are "general" UN organizational matters and the Congo. The former might be routinely expected to show up in a media coverage study of whatever institution is being studied, as it does here. The latter deserves a bit more extensive commentary. Insofar as the priority of its consideration divides the Third World at all, such division stems from that topic's being the #1 UN story in the U.S. black press in 1963, too, and not just in 1961, when it is likewise #1 in all three Third World presses. Insofar as it manifests a unified, common concern of the Third World, however, which it does, it does so not at all uniquely, since this is the #1 UN story, usually by far, in every newspaper that I have ever looked at for 1961. And 1961 is, again, the biggest UN coverage year, also usually by far and practically everywhere, of the ones that I have ever sampled. Coverage of UN activities has never since exceeded those totals, anywhere. I doubt now, at least in any foreseeable "short run" future, that it ever will.

IV. CONCLUSIONS: ONE WORLD, THIRD WORLD, NO WORLDS

Conclusions may be quickly stated or restated in respect to one or another of the "worlds" that have been investigated here. First in regard to One World, which the United Nations itself may be presumed to represent, does it fare well or poorly,

and at whose hands? It fares not very well. UNITAR had seemed to hope a decade ago that interest in the UN would be "heightened" in "developing" countries to counterbalance its apparent loss of favor in those more "advanced." It has not been, although interest in the UN in anglophone Africa has fallen less low than it has in Asia and has even been remarkably stable over a fairly long period of time now. This may not much encourage the UN -- presumably it will at least disappoint it -- but it is not quite as pessimistic a record as it might have been, and as it has been elsewhere. The nature of even continuing anglophone African (and black American) interests in the UN, however, is itself somewhat discouraging, at least at first glance, being rather more divisive than cooperative in character: How can the UN be used against the white "enemy?" How can it be best exploited to extract more financial aid (or relief) from the rich? Institutions, naturally enough, are supported by members or participants who believe that they can and will provide some useful "pay-offs." The whole Third World must get discouraged in the pursuit of these major political and economic objectives -- the political ones of which over the last thirty years have been much more vital in once almost completely colonized Africa -- but the anglophone African and black American "worlds" still remain attentive. Attention is almost always better than no attention. A stable level is better than a declining one. Still, a mixed verdict at best.

The Third World must also be discouraged with itself. Although focused entirely on comparative news coverage of a particular institution, the evidence adduced in this study suggests that the one-time "Afro-Asian" sector, at least, of what we are now calling the Third World does not have very many basically political interests in common -- not even "anti-colonialism," despite the more or less common colonial history through which almost all of its component national units have fairly recently passed -- and hangs together, if it hangs together at all, pretty much on economics (or "development") alone: Witness the overwhelming top priority which the presses of all Third World countries surveyed here have given to the UN topic of "agencies and aid." Even in this more consensual policy area the operational strains must be enormous, with the West trying actively to divide the "OPEC poor" from the really "poor poor," although thus far without very great success.

"One world" is thus clearly not strong, while the "Third World" within it has always been somewhat less united -- less emotionally committed to itself, as it were -- than it may once have seemed. Now even that appearance seems increasingly to falter. We may simply be in the presence of a concept anymore whose time has passed. As Alan Mountjoy has warned us, appropriately enough: "Hard and fast

divisions and groupings become less and less meaningful except for particular ends. Have we not reached the stage where groups should be identified by appropriate criteria for particular ends, accepting the fact that positions are not fixed and if the ends are changed, a different pattern may emerge?"[27] That is at most an academic caution. Politically, for One World or Third, the last word may more belong to British Foreign Secretary George Canning (1823): "So things are getting back to a wholesome state again. Every nation for itself and God for us all."[28] To which, more than a century and a half later, we might add the disturbing question: Whose God?

FOOTNOTES

1. Szalai, Alexander, et al., The United Nations and the News Media (United Nations: UNITAR, 1972), 140, 19.

2. Keith S. Petersen, "Three Asian and Three First World Urban/National Newspapers Cover the United Nations, 1949-1977" (paper, International Studies Association, 1980) and "U. S. Black Newspaper Coverage of the UN and U. S. White Coverage, 1948-1975," International Organization 33:4 (Autumn 1979), 525-539.

3. A good recent summary may be found in a related series of "Forum" pieces which have appeared in the first two volumes of the Third World Quarterly (London, 1979-), particularly Leslie Wolf-Phillips, "Why Third World?" I:1 (January, 1979), 105-115, and S. D. Muni, "The Third World: Concept and Controversy," I:3 (July 1979), 119-128.

4. As Robert A. Mortimer does in his informative monograph, The Third World Coalition in International Politics (N. Y.: Praeger, 1980).

5. S. D. Muni, "The Third World," cited, p. 126.

6. Or more recently by a low "physical quality of life" index (PQLI), which uses an "adjusted" mix of three measurements: infant mortality, life expectancy and basic literacy. This standard, like industrialization, helps to put the "rich" (very high GNP per capita) Arab-OPEC countries in their probably more "right" place or, in any event, in the place that they would themselves claim, that is, as fellow members of the Third World. By early 1970's GNP per capita figures the three richest countries (out of 150) in the world turn out to be Qatar, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates; by PQLI criteria, however, these three rank respectively only 35th, 88th and 38th from the bottom. Qatar's and the U.A.E.'s immediate PQLI neighbors are Tanzania, Laos, Zaire, People's Republic of Yemen, Ghana and Bangladesh; Kuwait's are Reunion, Mexico, Paraguay and Albania. See Morris, Morris David, Measuring the Condition of the World's Poor: The Physical Quality of Life Index (New York: Pergamon Press, 1979), especially Appendix B, pp. 138-145.

7. "A minority is a group seen by its members (or oppressors) as being part of the subdivision that is the state whilst an ethnic group sees itself in terms of cohesive, even blood-marked relatedness, the next stage of [whose] political (and ideological) consciousness is achieved when that same group begins to negotiate for recognition as a nation." Grant McCall, "Four Worlds of Experience and Action," Third World Quarterly II:3 (July 1980), 542.

8. Hero, Alfred O., Jr., American Religious Groups View Foreign Policy: Trends in Rank and File Opinion, 1937-1969 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1973),

83-110, 364-419; Hero, "American Negroes and U. S. Foreign Policy, 1937-1967," Journal of Conflict Resolution XIII:2 (June 1969), 220-251; and Laudicina, Paul A., World Poverty and Development: A Survey of American Opinion (Washington, D.C.: Oversees Development Council, 1973), 78-79.

9. Others, be it noted, do not. See Singham, A. W., editor, The Nonaligned Movement in World Politics (Westport, Conn.: Lawrence Hill and Co., 1977), 24-27, 190-221.

10. This relative selfishness of vision might be expected anyway and is fully borne out in a recent 13-country survey of media coverage of "foreign news": Robert L. Stevenson and Richard R. Cole, "Foreign News Flow and the UNESCO Debate" (convention paper, International Studies Association, 1980). An African practitioner/analyst has derived three criteria for international news story selection in a study of the output "over a period of several months" of "African communication media," particularly in Western and Central Africa: "psycho-political security," "community of interests" and the "imperatives of national policy." All three are obviously "selfish" in intent and effect. See Alcino Louis da Costa, "New criteria for the selection of news in African countries," News Values and Principles of Cross-cultural Communication (Paris: UNESCO, 1980), 7-15.

11. The quoted characterizations of these papers are from Wolsley, Roland E., The Black Press, USA (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1971). I also have more limited data on three other black papers which are less conveniently exploitable here but whose inclusion would significantly change neither the direction nor the degree of the comparative conclusions that will be presented in this study. See Petersen, "U. S. Black Newspaper Coverage," cited.

12. Schwarz, Walter, Nigeria (New York: Praeger, 1968), 54.

13. W. A. E. Skurnik, "Foreign News Coverage Compared: Six African Newspapers" (mimeo, 1979), 3.

14. Kaplan, Irving, et al., Area Handbook for Ethiopia (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971), 328.

15. John C. G. Isoba, "The Rise and Fall of Uganda's Newspaper Industry, 1900-1976," Journalism Quarterly 52:2 (Summer 1980), 224-233.

16. The exceptions (of either necessity or convenience) were as follows: 1963 for the 3 First World, 1949 and 1963 for the 3 Asian and 1957 for the two U. S. black papers; the years before 1957 for the Ethiopian Herald and before 1963 for the Voice of Uganda/Argus.

17. Appropriate substitutions were made as infrequently necessary either when a paper was not published on a given day in this grid or when one or more of its issues were otherwise "missing."

18. This is no fluke. The percent measurement of this decline is almost uncannily the same in all six individual papers, regardless of ideological posture, country or "world." Petersen, "Three Asian and Three First World Urban/National Newspapers," cited, Table II.

19. For the New York Times alone 1961 was very narrowly only the second "most attentive" year of these surveyed (1953 was the first), but its 1961 emphasis was for the same reasons: the Congo and Hammarskjold. See Keith S. Petersen, "Analysis of Declining Coverage of U. N. by New York Times," Journalism Quarterly 53:3 (Autumn 1976), 544-48. For all other individual papers used here 1961 was number 2.

20. Russett, Bruce M., No Clear and Present Danger (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1972), 98-103.

21. This aid, insofar as it is "UN" aid at all, is typically allocated and/or administered by "specialized" or "special" agencies that I am calling either "money agencies" (designated by the symbol $), which have fairly substantial funding of their own, at least by UN standards, or "others" (symbolized by a ¢), which do not. The "money" agencies, as listed in Table 1, are: IBRD, IMF, IFC, IDA, UNIDO, UNDP, TAP and ETAP. The "others" include such "welfare" and "service" agencies as WHO, FAO, ICAO, ITU, ILO, etc. The activities of these agencies that the press reports may be generally "headquarters" events and "general" meetings (Hdqtrs $ and Hdqtrs ¢) or "fieldwork," regional and local meetings and direct application of "aid" (Field $ and Field ¢). Of the four-part breakdown of possible options of sub-focus that this system of subheadings supplies, it may be of some interest to note that the anglophone African press is overwhelmingly more concerned with the work of the welfare and service agencies (which account for all five sub-heading listings that appear at all) and slightly more often with their fieldwork (3 times) than with their headquarters events (2 times). There is no inherently "logical" explanation for this preference. Suffice to say for the most part, especially, of course, in regard to fieldwork, that representatives of UN agencies who show up on the local scene for whatever reasons seem to be regarded as being particularly newsworthy in that local press and that "¢" agency representatives from technical assistance teams to agency directors-general, appear quite a bit more often than represen-

tatives of "$" agencies. Clearly one of the best ways for the UN to burnish its image is to show its face.

22. This range of comparison most obviously omits the Latin Americans and Arabs (and the francophone Africans) from among the other most likely candidates. It is true that I have no Latin American evidence and no immediate prospects of obtaining any. But Latin Americans have been relative late-comers to, and are still underrepresented in, the Third World's political and, to a considerably lesser extent, its economic concerns (Mortimer, The Third World Coalition in World Politics, cited); they are in general much longer removed from their own "colonial trauma" (Muni, "The Third World: Concept and Controversy," cited); and, finally, they are by and large considerably less poor than most other commonly accepted Third World denizens (Haiti is the only Latin American country among 38 "Fourth World" members identified in Wolf-Phillips' "Third World Data" table, "Why Third World?" cited, pp. 110-111). Latin America is nevertheless a commonly accepted Third World component whose perspectives, whatever they are, on these matters I am sorry to have missed. Arabs I have missed too, but not Muslims: Pakistan (87% Muslim) is in my Asian and Nigeria (45%) in my African sample. Finally, I am already at work on an extension of these comparisons into francophone Africa where my sample will certainly include both Algeria and Tunisia. I have a very small amount of French language evidence now from which, however, I cannot very much usefully generalize except to surmise, as I now do, that it will show some interesting variations from the evidence of predominantly British Africa.

23. Rankings on these overall lists were determined first by the mere numbers of times that each entry had appeared among the annual lists of "top three" stories in each press with any ties being broken, wherever possible, by the total "weighted" values of those listings on the basis of 3 points for each first place listing, 2 points for second, 1½ points for a tie for second, etc. Thus, a "single-shot" entry in first place in a given year (3 points) would rank ahead of another single listing which had appeared, say, in second place (2 points) or tied for third (½ point), etc., in the same or any other year. Frequency prevails over intensity but intensity decides (if possible) where frequency cannot.

24. Petersen, "U. S. Black Newspaper Coverage of the UN and U. S. White Coverage," cited, 533-34.

25. The record for francophone Africa will probably be about the same. In the one year, 1973, for which I yet have comparable evidence, five French language African papers gave the same item top priority with 43 out of 154 stories (27.9% of the coverage); their next ranking story (not surprisingly the Mideast with both Tunisia and Algeria in the newspaper sample) got only 11%.

26. It may be important to remember, however, that the anglophone African press gave Korea only a "weak" first place emphasis in 1953 (15 out of a total of only 49 stories, 30.6%, in three papers) --and that all three of those papers were written and read in then still colonial "countries" -- whereas three Asian papers gave it a strong first place emphasis in a quite heavy UN year (59 out of 212 stories, 27.8%) and the First World press an even stronger one in an even heavier year (90½ out of 273 stories, 33.2%, in three papers). Korea for the West -- certainly for the United States -- was mainly a drastic heating up of the Cold War: ideology and presumed national safety. For Asia it was, of course, an Asian war: neighborhood. But blacks everywhere seem to have been relatively bored (or disgusted) with the former, in the true spirit of non-alignment, and unconcerned with the latter, in the true spirit of selfishness. Why, though, should this have been true of American blacks who were, after all, getting killed in the war? Because, again, of their "minority" status, it would seem. U. S. black papers paid virtually no attention to high "UN" policy decisions, or to UN military operations as such. What (very little) they cared about came at the end of the war in the prospects and implementation of POW exchanges and the return at last of "our boys," many of whom, of course, were black.

27. Alan B. Mountjoy, "Worlds Without End," Third World Quarterly II:4 (October 1980), 757.

28. Quoted in Ward, A. W., et al., editors, The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. X, The Restoration (N. Y. Macmillan, 1911), 37.

TABLE 1: CATEGORY HEADINGS AND SUBHEADINGS FOR NEWSPAPER STORIES ABOUT THE UN

1. GENL UN ORGANIZATION & PROCESS	a) Gen'l institutional matters & issues (financing, etc.) b) Admissions of new Members c) Secretaries-General & Secretariat (Hammarskjold, etc.)
2. UNIT ORGANIZATION & PROCESS	a) General Assembly, standing cmttes, other cmttes b) Other main organs & cmttes (not including Secretariat)
3. MEMBERS' DELEGATIONS, OFFICIALS	a) Own b) Others
4. MEMBERS' POLICIES OR APPRAISALS	a) Own b) Others
5. SPECLZD & SPECIAL AGENCIES & AID	a) HDQ & genl mtgs: Money agencies=$; other agencies=ø. b) Fieldwork & aid: Money agencies=$; other agencies=ø. ($ Ags=: IBRD, IMF, IFC, IDA, UNIDO, UNDP, TAP, ETAP)
6. REG'L ECON COMM'S	
7. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, HUMANTARIAN	a) Miscellaneous (drug control, genl information, etc.) b) Refugees (not including Middle East, below) c) Rights (freedom of press, rights of women, etc.) d) Race discrimination in general e) Colonialism (Trust Coun, Cmtte on Info, Cmtte of 24)
8. GENERAL POLICY ISSUES	a) War & peace (arms, aggression, terrorism, etc.) b) Environment & welfare (population, sea, space, etc.)
9. MIDDLE EAST	(Arab-Israeli, Lebanon)
10. KOREA	
11. CONGO	
12. CHINA SEAT	
13. MISC WEST V EAST	(Ideological "Cold War" issues not specified elsewhere)
14. WEST V SELF	(Northern Ireland, Cyprus, etc.)
15. US INTERVENTION	a) Latin America b) Elsewhere
16. ASIA V WEST	(Indonesia, Yemen, Goa)
17. ASIA V SELF	a) India-Pakistan b) Other
18. AFRICA V WEST	(South Africa, Rhodesia, vs. Portugal, vs. France, etc.)
19. AFRICA V SELF	
20. SOUTH V NORTH	(UNCTAD, New Int'l Econ Order, New Int'l Info Order)

TABLE 2: NUMBERS OF UN STORIES PER YEAR IN SAMPLE YEARS, 1949-1977

YEAR	VCICE OF UGNDA	ETHIO HERLD	TANZ DAILY NEWS	LAGOS DAILY TIMES	WEST AFRIC PILOT	LAST THREE COMB	TWO U.S. BLACK	THREE ASIAN	THREE FIRST WORLD
1949			13	12	29	54	41		193
1953			27	4	18	49	41	212	273
1957		88	36	21	25	82		245	229
1961		90	52	62	73	187	80	391	343
1963	41	50	38	21	28	87	49		
1965	30	54	25	20	50	95	35	217	183
1967	47	34	28	22	35	85	18	210	156
1969	21	45	43	15	10	68	13	158	102
1971	26	57	42	24	6	72	36	164	127
1973	36	57	35	21	11	67	36	117	73
1975	28	42	37	15	17	69	43	123	76
1977	32	29	42	19	18	79	59	67	61
TOTLS						915	451	1904	1816
AVERS						76.25	41	190.4	165.1

TABLE 3: TOP THREE UN STORIES (WITH "SUB-STORIES"), BY PERCENTS AS JUSTIFIED,* IN AFRICAN NEWSPAPERS SAMPLED, BY YEAR

YEAR	TAN. DAILY NEWS	DAILY TIMES (LAGOS)	WEST AFRICAN PILOT	ETHIOPIAN HERALD	VOICE OF UGANDA	ALL PAPERS COMBINED
1949	(13 Stories) [No measurable %s]	(12 Stories) [No measurable %s]	(29 Stories) [No measurable %s]			(54 Stories) 1. EC SOC HUM 29.6 [No other over 15%] 3.5. MIDEAST 14.8 3.5.MMBRS POLS 14.8 (Others 14.8)
1953	(27 Stories) 1. Korea 33.3 [No othr mesrbl %s]	(4 Stories) [No measurable %s]	(18 Stories) [No measurable %s]			(49 Stories) 1. KOREA 30.6 [No othr mesrbl %s]
1957	(36 Stories) 1. Ec Soc Hum 22.2 (Colonial 22.2) 2. Unit Org/Pr 15.1 (Genl Assy 15.1) [No othr measrbl %]	(21 Stories) 1. Ec Soc Hum 23.8 (Colonial 23.8) [No othr mesrbl %s]	(25 Stories) 1. Mideast 24.0 [No othr mesrbl %s]	(88 Stories) 1. Spec Ags 38.6 (Hdqtrs ø 23.9) [No other over 15%] 3. Genl Issues 11.4 (War/Peace 11.4)		(170 Stories) 1. SPEC AGS [illegible].1 (Hdqtrs ø 14.1) [No other over 15%] 3. EC SOC HUM 14.1 (Colonial 12.3)
1961	(52 Stories) 1. Congo 36.5 2. Genl Org/Pr 21.1 (Hmmrskjld 11.5) 3. Spec Ags 1[illegible].5	(62 Stories) 1. Congo 32.3 2. Genl Org/Pr 21.0 3. Spec Ags 12.9	(73 Stories) 1. Congo 34.2 2. Genl Org/Pr 15.1 [No othr measrbl %]	(90 Stories) 1. Congo 35.5 2. Genl Org/Pr 21.1 (Hmmrskjld 12.2) 3. Spec Ags 18.8		(277 Stories) 1. CONGO 34.7 2. GENL ORG/PR 19.5 (Hmmrskjld 10.5) 3. SPEC AGS 13.7
1963	(38 Stories) 1. Ec Soc Hum 21.[illegible] (Colonial 15.8) 2. Afr v West 18.4 [No othr measrbl %]	(21 Stories) 1. Afr v West 23.8 [No othr mesrbl %s]	(28 Stories) 1. Ec Soc Hum 28.6 [No othr mesrbl %s]	(50 Stories) 1. Afr v West 24.0 2. Genl Org/Pr 20.0 [No othr measrbl %]	(41 Stories) 1. Afr v West 26.8 2. Spec Ags 21.9 [No othr measrbl %]	(178 Stories) 1. AFR V WEST 21.9 2. GENL ORG/PR 15.2 (Genl Inst 7.8) 3. EC SOC HUM 13.5 (Colonial 8.4)
1965	(25 Stories) 1. Afr v West 24.0 2. Asia v Self 20.0 (India-Pak 20.0) [No othr measrbl %]	(20 Stories) [No measurable %s]	(50 Stories) 1. Spec Ags 28.0 (Field ø 18.0) 2. Afr v West 18.0 [No othr measrbl %]	(54 Stories) 1. Afr v West 29.6 2. Spec Ags 18.5 (Field ø 11.1) 3. Genl Org/Pr 13.0	(30 Stories) 1. Genl Org/Pr 20.0 [No othr mesrbl %s]	(179 Stories) 1. SPEC AGS 20.1 (Field ø 10.6) 2. AFR V WEST 19.5 3. ASIA V SELF 14.0 (India-Pak 14.0)

[Continued]

TABLE 3: page 2

1967	(28 Stories)	(22 Stories)	(35 Stories)	(34 Stories)	(47 Stories)	(166 Stories)
	1. Afr v West 25.0	1. Mideast 27.3	1. Spec Ags 25.7	1. Afr v West 30.9	[No story over 20%]	1. AFR V WEST 21.1
	2. Ec Soc Hum 21.4	[No othr mesrbl %s]	2. Afr v West 18.6	[No othr mesrbl %s]	2.5.Afr v West 17.0	2. SPEC AGS 17.5
	[No othr measrbl %]		[No othr measrbl %]		2.5. Spec Ags 17.0	3. MIDEAST 14.2
1969	(43 Stories)	(15 Stories)	(10 Stories)	(45 Stories)	(21 Stories)	(134 Stories)
	1.5. Spec Ags 20.9	1. Afr v Self 33.3		1. Unit Org/Pr 20.0	1.5.Unit Org/P 23.8	[No story over 20%]
	1.5.Afr v West 20.9	[No othr mesrbl %s]	[No measurable %s]	(Genl Assy 14.2)	1.5.Afr v West 23.8	2.5.UNIT ORG/P 17.9
	3. Unit Org/Pr 16.3			2. Spec Ags 15.5	[No othr measrbl %]	(Genl Assy 14.2)
				[No othr measrbl %]		2.5. SPEC AGS 17.9
1971	(42 Stories)	(24 Stories)	(6 Stories)	(57 Stories)	(26 Stories)	(155 Stories)
	1. Afr v West 21.4	1. China Seat 29.2		[No story over 20%]	1. China Seat 25.0	[No story over 20%]
	2. China Seat 19.0	[No othr mesrbl %s]	[No measurable %s]	2.3. Spec Ags 15.8	2. Spec Ags 23.1	2. CHINA SEAT 19.7
	[No othr measrbl %]			2.3.Ec Soc Hum 15.8	[No othr measrbl %]	3. SPEC AGS 18.1
				2.3.China Seat 15.8		
1973	(35 Stproes)	(21 Stories)	(11 Stories)	(57 Stories)	(36 Stories)	(160 Stories)
	1. Spec Ags 28.6			1. Spec Ags 33.3	1. Spec Ags 22.2	1. SPEC AGS 28.1
	2. Ec Soc Hum 25.7	[No measurable %s]	[No measurable %s]	(Field $ 10.5)	2. Mideast 19.5	[No other over 15%]
	[No othr measrbl %]			[No other over 15%]	[No othr measrbl %]	3. AFR V WEST 13.4
				3. Afr v West 14.9		
1975	(37 Stories)	(15 Stories)	(17 Stories)	(42 Stories)	(28 Stories)	(139 Stories)
	[No story over 20%]	1.5.Mmbrs Dels 26.7	1. Spec Ags 41.2	1. Spec Ags 33.3	1. Spec Ags 32.1	1. SPEC AGS 29.5
	2. Spec Ags 18.9	1.5. Spec Ags 26.7	[No othr mesrbl %s]	2. Ec Soc Hum 16.7	(Field ø 25.0)	(Field ø 15.1)
	[No othr measrbl %]	[No othr measrbl %]		[No othr measrbl %]	[No othr mesrbl %s]	[No othr mesrbl %s]
1977	(42 Stories)	(19 Stories)	(18 Stories)	(29 Stories)	(32 Stories)	(140 Stories)
	1. Spec Ags 40.5	1. Spec Ags 31.6	1. Spec Ags 33.3	1. Spec Ags 34.5	1. Spec Ags 37.5	1. SPEC AGS 36.4
	(Field ø 16.7)	[No othr mesrbl %s]	[No othr mesrbl %s]	2. Afr v West 25.9	2.5.Unit Org/P 15.6	(Hdqtrs ø 13.6)
	2. Afr v West 21.4			[No othr measrbl %]	2.5.Afr v West 15.6	(Field ø 13.6)
	[No othr measrbl %]					2. AFR V WEST 18.6
						[No othr measrbl %]

* To avoid undue distortion, two percentage restrictions have been applied in this table. (1) A "first" story in a given newspaper-year, in order to be listed as such, had to have gotten at least 20% of that year's UN sample coverage, a "second" story at least 15% and a "third" at least 10%. (2) To be recorded at all, any story or "sub-story" (in parentheses) had to have achieved or exceeded one or another of the following percentages of total UN stories, depending on their quantity in a given sample-year: at least 7.5% of more than 100 stories, at least 10% of 51-100 stories, 15% of 31-50, 20% of 21-30 or 25% of 15-20; no percentage emphases were recorded in a total year sample of fewer than 15 stories.

TABLE 4: COMPARATIVE STORY EMPHASES

BY RANKS OF FREQUENCIES OF LISTINGS AMONG TOP THREE STORIES

Overall Rank	STORY AREA	US BLACK	ANGLOPHONE AFRICAN	ANGLOPHONE ASIAN
1.	SPEC AGS & AID	6	1	1
2.	AFRICA VS WEST	1	2	10½
3.	EC SOC HUM	2	3	10½
4.	GENL ORG & PROC	3	4	4
5.	MIDEAST	10	7	2
6.	ASIA VS SELF	10	10	3
7.	CONGO	5	5½	6½
8.	MEMBERS' DELS	4	12	10½
9.	UNIT ORG & PROC	10	9	5
10.	KOREA	10	5½	6½
11.	CHINA SEAT	10	8	8
12.	MEMBERS' POLS	7	11	10½